

1958

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

17129

ing, flower arrangement, horse breeding, or tap dancing, is that not correct?

The Senator from Michigan said:
That is not correct.

But I can find nothing in the bill which bars use of the funds for any such educational purpose, and the Senator from Michigan refuses to specify where in the bill such limitations could be found.

All the talk about mathematics and science is the commercial to get the public to buy the product.

There is another hidden twist in this bill which should be brought out into the light.

One of the most curious provisions in the bill is title VIII, which is supposed to help train our people in foreign languages.

Section 801 (A) says that funds for language development may provide for instruction in such fields as history, political science, linguistics, economics, sociology, geography, anthropology.

But that is not all. The commissioner shall give priority to contracts for the Middle East, Africa, or Asia—including the Soviet Union.

This is a beautiful plan for deluging our schools with courses on Soviet institutions and filling up the remaining time with information about the uncommitted areas of Asia and Africa which are the darlings of our State Department.

Thus even the sections of the bill which seem at first sight to be most closely connected with defense turn out, on inspection, to be more educational "boondoggling."

The people of Indiana believe our students should get much less propagandizing about the might and achievements of the Soviet Union and a great deal more solid instruction in American history, American government, and the American economic system.

Section 801 (B) provides that the commissioner may also give stipends to individuals for such advance training, providing the students will be available for teaching, or for such other service of a public nature as may be permitted in the regulations of the commissioner.

Here is Federal regulation of the recipients of these subsidies.

Section 802 permits the commissioner to develop specialized material for use in such language culture centers.

This puts the Federal Government in the textbook business.

I will spare Senators a statement of what I think about title IX for putting the Federal Government into the middle of educational television, radio, and motion pictures.

I merely invite attention to the fact that the Commissioner has authority to make grants to public or nonprofit private agencies, and also contracts with private agencies which may be profit-making.

Is that the pipeline to the Hollywood moving picture producers? We know that the Federal Government used subsidies and other indirect powers to guide the moving picture industry and other mass mediums, during the days of the

OWI. This is a bigger and better OWI.

I will mention that section 931 says the Commissioner may provide advice, counsel, and so forth to increase the quality or depth or broaden the scope of our educational programs.

That is a very nice name for more Government propaganda on how much better the Federal Government does things than the States do.

I have already mentioned the pernicious implications of the sections for testing and guidance.

I will not repeat the overwhelming arguments against any new Federal spending in the dangerous state of the national finances today.

But I wish to point out, in closing, how powerful is the lobby of the organized educationists which is determined to have Federal aid and Federal regulation of our schools systems, with the sky the limit on what we spend.

These organized lobbies of educationists are already at work sending out their telegrams demanding repeal of my amendment.

These lobbies stand completely discredited as the sponsors of the statistics on shortage of classrooms, shortage of State funds, and other propaganda which were the mainstay of the federalizers until the sputniks went up, and they saw their chance to wrap their idol in the American flag.

Indiana is not influenced by these lobbies. Our school officials, our teachers, our parents, our taxpayers and our press all know well how completely they are committed to federalization and big spending, no matter how much red ink it takes.

I repeat, Mr. President, the people of Indiana want our State protected against federalization of our schools under the guise of national defense.

We hope the people of other States will join. If not, Indiana is proud to stand alone.

THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION CONFERENCE AT RIO DE JANEIRO

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the Senate was represented at the recent conference of the Interparliamentary Union, which was held at Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, from July 24 to August 1, inclusive. The delegates were named by the Vice President of the United States, pursuant to a provision in the appropriation bill dealing with the State Department, which we passed last year. It was my privilege to be one of the delegates so named and to participate in the conference. The members of the delegation and other Members of the Senate have said they felt there should be a report made to the Senate of the proceedings at the conference, and our participation in it. Owing to the fact that the return from Rio de Janeiro came during these last few weeks of the session, with the heavy schedule we have had for the consideration of proposed legislation each day, it has seemed impracticable heretofore to present that report.

I may say to the attachés and employees of the Senate that I shall make

this report as brief as I can. I shall try to make it comprehensive as possible, so that the report may be in the Record for Senators and others who may be interested to read it.

I may say to the few Senators who are on the floor at this late hour that I do not anticipate saying anything which requires their presence on the floor. I shall not make any controversial statements. I shall be happy to yield for questioning if Senators care to ask any questions. However, I am not flattering myself that at this late hour, shortly before 12 midnight, I shall evoke much comment.

Yet, Mr. President, because the Interparliamentary Union is an organization of many years standing, and because the conference at Rio de Janeiro came at the time it did, because it developed unusual interest on the part of the delegates there, and because, in my opinion, it deserves further consideration in the Senate as we come to the time of the meeting, which will be held in Warsaw, Poland, some attention should be given to what transpired this year, and some record should be made of it, with the thought that the leadership of the Senate on both sides of the aisle will probably wish, in my opinion, to give special consideration to early consideration and preparation for our participation in that coming conference.

The conference this year came only a few days after the landing of our troops in Lebanon in connection with the Middle East crisis. Behind all the debate and behind the meetings of committees there was the feeling on the part of the delegates that the position taken by the various parliamentary representatives was a reflection of the position of the governments of the respective countries represented. There was the feeling that as we move toward the meeting in Warsaw, Poland, next year, the first interplanetary meeting which will be held behind the Iron Curtain since World War II, unusual significance will be attached to it.

The Interparliamentary Union is not as well known, perhaps, as its long history deserves. It was started in 1882, as the result of the feeling among members of parliamentary bodies on the continent of Europe that international understanding could be improved by the holding of meetings from time to time of delegates from their parliamentary bodies. They have not been held every year, as is evidenced by the fact that the conference at Rio de Janeiro was the 47th conference, although the history of the Interparliamentary Union runs back to 1882. In its long history, the Interparliamentary Union has made recommendations on many subjects which have marked an advance in international understanding and in international relationships. It takes pride in the fact that its recommendation led to the establishment of the International Court of Justice at The Hague. That was one of the landmarks in its development. Further, it is proud that it recommended the formation of some organizations, such as the League of Nations, and, later, the organization which

17130

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 19

came to be known as the United Nations Organization.

This is a unique international gathering, in which the representatives are not representatives of the executive or the administrative branches of the Government, but representatives of parliamentary bodies. Every delegate there had a constituency. Every delegate there was elected or selected in some manner to represent a constituency. So the statements that were made, and the points of view that were expressed, were largely of elected officials, and, in every case, the expressions of persons who had constituencies at home.

The United States delegation was composed of the following persons from the House of Representatives: HENRY TALLE, of Iowa; HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana; KENNETH KEATING, of New York; W. ROBERT POAGE, of Texas; CATHERINE ST. GEORGE, of New York; ANTONI N. SABLAK, of Connecticut; and MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, of Ohio. The representation from the Senate consisted of the following Senators, who had been named by the Vice President on the nominations of the majority and minority: ALLEN FREAR, of Delaware; MIKE MONRONEY, of Oklahoma; FRANCIS CASE, of South Dakota; JOHN HOBLITZELL, of West Virginia; and Judge Homer Ferguson, of Michigan, who was a former president of one conference of the Interparliamentary Union, and therefore an honorary member.

The wives of the United States Delegates and officers who were present were Mrs. Feighan, Mrs. Boggs, Mrs. Sablak, Mrs. Poage, Mrs. Monroney, Mrs. Case, Mrs. Hoblitzell, Mrs. Dunham, and Mrs. Galloway.

I mention the ladies because it is one of the traditions of the Interparliamentary Union that the wives of the Delegates should be present so far as possible. There were several women delegates, including Mrs. ST. GEORGE of our own delegation, and there were other women delegates from other parliamentary bodies. The women had their own functions, which lent much to the character of the conference and to the exchange of ideas between the delegates, and I believe made a real contribution to the understanding that such gatherings achieve.

In that connection, the United States delegation followed the tradition of holding a reception one evening during the conference, to which the delegates from other countries were invited, those in this hemisphere, and those of the countries with which we have been associated in ideals.

In addition, we invited the entire membership of the Polish delegation, since Poland will be the host country next year, and also the heads of the delegations of the other countries.

In addition to the Members of Congress and their wives, we invited some officials who were most helpful and useful to the delegation.

There was Dr. Franklin Dunham, who holds an important position in the De-

partment of Health, Education, and Welfare, and who has been Secretary General for the Inter-Parliamentary Union group for several years.

Also, Dr. George B. Galloway was present as secretary of the delegation. Dr. Galloway, as Senators know, is a valued member of the staff of the Library of Congress, and is an expert in legislation and in the history of parliamentary bodies. He had much to do with the formulation of the Legislative Reorganization Act. He was a valuable counselor, as was Dr. Dunham, by reason of his experience and his long acquaintance with the operation of the Inter-Parliamentary Union.

In addition, we had the clerical and secretarial assistance of Miss Christine Gallagher and Miss Jane Case, who handled the details of arranging for the meeting, prepared the invitations, wrote the speeches, and did other secretarial work.

Mr. Carl Marcy, chief of staff of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and Mr. Zim, of the United States Information Service, were also with us and were most helpful because of their knowledge of the international treaties and international agreements of one sort or another.

From now on I shall seek to cover the proceedings by insertions. While there will be several of them, and they may be at some length, I should have no objection if the manager of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD wishes to take my entire remarks and note that they were made at this time, and make the entire insertion of my remarks, together with the other insertions, in the Appendix of the RECORD for the following day.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that may be done, because it may facilitate the work of the Government Printing Office and the delivery of the RECORD.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I am certain there would be no objection to that type of procedure. I certainly have no objection to that type of request.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it may be noted in the proceedings for today that I have made this report at this time, but that the text of my report and the insertions which may go into it may appear in the Appendix of the RECORD for the following day, as a means of conserving time for the Government Printing Office tonight, and perhaps some clerical work on the part of some of the members of the staff.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the names of the countries which were represented, together with the individuals from those countries who served as vice president.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNION INTERPARLEMENTAIRE—VICE PRESIDENTS OF THE 47TH CONFERENCE, RIO DE JANEIRO, 1958

Allemagne (République fédérale d'), Dr. Gerstenmaier.

Amérique (Etats-Unis d'), M. Talle.

Argentine, M. Weidmann.

Australie, M. Hamilton.

Autriche, M. Stürzgh.

Birmanie, U. Yu Saing.

Bésil, M. Juracy Magalhães.

Bulgarie, M. Kosovsky.

Ceylan, M. Wijesinghe.

Chili, M. Galleguillos.

Danemark, M. Andersen.

Espagne, M. Fraga Iribarne.

France, M. Finjoz.

Ghana, M. J. E. Appiah.

Grande-Bretagne, Sir Col. Stoddart-Scott.

Haiti, M. Belizaire.

Hongrie, M. Rónai.

Indonésie, Mme. Supeni.

Iran, M. Matine-Daftary.

Irlande, M. Liam Cosgrave.

Israël, M. Hacohen.

Italie, M. Macrelli.

Japon, M. Nanjo.

Laos, M. Tiao Souvannarath.

Liberia, M. Tolbert.

Luxembourg, M. Grégoire.

Norvège, M. Finn Moe.

Pakistan, M. Abdul Wahab Khan.

Panama, M. Aleman.

Paraguay, M. Cameron.

Pays-Bas (Netherlands), M. van der Goes

van Naters.

Pérou, M. Arca-Parró.

Philippines, M. Primicias.

Pologne, M. Wende.

Roumanie, M. Vasilichi.

Soudan, M. Zarroug.

Suède, M. Sandler.

Suisse, M. Boerlin.

Tchécoslovaquie, M. Krofta.

Thaïlande, M. Prasit Chullakes.

Tunisie, M. Perjari Ben Hadj Amar.

Turquie, M. Erkan.

U. R. S. S., M. Volkov.

Viet-Nam, M. Pham-van-Nhu.

Yougoslavie, M. Bebler.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the names of the countries appear in French. French was 1 of the 2 official languages of the Conference. The Conference operated under the procedure, which is followed in the United Nations, of having all speeches simultaneously translated by the use of headsets, so that one could listen to the proceedings in either English or French. The Russian delegates could also listen in Russian. I think there was also a translation in Spanish and Portuguese. But the official languages of the Conference were English and French.

I shall read the names of the countries in English, so that the translation may appear.

Germany, United States of America, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Burma, Brazil, Bulgaria, Ceylon, Chili, Denmark, Spain, France, Ghana, Great Britain, Haiti, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Laos, Liberia, Luxembourg, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, the Netherlands, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Rumania, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Czechoslovakia, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Russia, Vietnam, and Yugoslavia.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point the timetable of the

1958

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

17131

Conference, showing the proceedings by topics which were discussed. They ranged from the general debate to the special sessions on the strengthening of peace, the reduction of armaments, cultural exchanges, and debates of that nature.

There being no objection, the timetable was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION—47TH CONFERENCE

TIMETABLE OF THE CONFERENCE

Thursday, July 24, 1958

- 10 a. m. Inaugural ceremony.
- 11 a. m. Opening of the Conference.
- 11:30 a. m. General debate.
- 2:30 p. m. General debate (continuation).

Friday, July 25

- 10 a. m. General debate (continuation).
- 2:30 p. m. General debate (conclusion).

Saturday, July 26

- 10 a. m. The principles governing the investment of foreign capital in countries in process of economic development.
- 2:30 p. m. The principles governing the investment of foreign capital in countries in process of economic development (continuation and conclusion).

Sunday, July 27

Rec.

Monday, July 28

- 10 a. m. The strengthening of peace—Senator MONROE.
- 2:30 p. m. The strengthening of peace (continuation and conclusion).

Tuesday, July 29

- 10 a. m. Political and Organization Committee.
- Reduction of Armaments Committee—Senator CASE.
- Economic and Financial Committee—Senator HOBLITZELL.
- 2:30 p. m. Cultural exchanges between countries and freedom of information.

Wednesday, July 30

- 10 a. m. Cultural exchanges between countries and freedom of information (continuation and conclusion).
- 2:30 p. m. The development of representative assemblies in non-self-governing territories.

Thursday, July 31

- 10 a. m. Social and Humanitarian Committee and Committee on Non-Self-Governing Territories (joint sitting).
- Juridical Committee and Committee on Intellectual Relations (joint sitting).
- 2:30 p. m. Plenary meeting. The Work and Achievements of the Organization of American States. Speech by Mr. Jose Mora, Secretary General.
- 3:15 p. m. Available for meetings of regional groups.
- 5 p. m. Interparliamentary Council.

Friday, August 1

- 10 a. m. Reports of the study committees and votes on the draft resolutions concerning:
 - (a) The principles governing investment of foreign capital in countries in process of economic development.
 - (b) The strengthening of peace.
 - (c) Cultural exchange between countries and freedom of information.
 - (d) The development of representative assemblies in non-self-governing territories.
- 12 noon. Election of a member of the Executive Committee.
- 3 p. m. Communication relating to the composition of the Interparliamentary Council for the period from the 47th to the 48th Conference.
- Closure of the conference.

No. 144—31

AGENDA OF THE CONFERENCE

1. Election of the President and Vice Presidents of the Conference.
2. General debate.

3. The principles governing the investment of foreign private or governmental capital in countries in process of economic development. Reports to be presented, in the name of the Committee on Economic and Financial Questions, by Mr. Saturnino Braga (Brazil) and Dr. Fritz Heliwig (Federal Republic of Germany).

4. The strengthening of peace:
 - (a) The problem of atomic weapons and nuclear tests.
 - (b) The possibility of establishing an international police force.

Reports to be presented, in the name of the Committee on Reduction of Armaments, by Col. Tufton Beamish (Great Britain) and Mr. Jacques de Maupeou (France).

5. Cultural exchanges between countries and freedom of information.

(a) Cultural agreements and their role in improving relations between peoples.

(b) National and international aspects of freedom of the press and information.

Reports to be presented, in the names of the Committee on Intellectual Relations and Juridical Questions, by Mr. Pierre Nothomb (Belgium) and Mr. Pierre Gregoir (Luxembourg).

6. The development of representative assemblies in non-self-governing territories.

Report to be presented, in the name of the Committee on Non-Self-Governing Territories and Ethnical Questions, by Mrs. Supeni (Indonesia).

7. Election of a member of the Executive Committee.

Mr. Abdul Wahab Khan (Pakistan) was designated by the Interparliamentary Council, in the course of its 81st session held in London in September 1957, to occupy, until the next Conference, the seat on the Executive Committee left vacant following the election of Professor Codacci-Pisanelli as President of the Council. In accordance with article 17, paragraph 9, of the statutes, the 47th Conference will be required to elect a member to occupy Professor Codacci-Pisanelli's seat for 1 year; i. e., until the term expires in 1959.

8. Composition of the Interparliamentary Council for the period from the 47th to the 48th Conference.

Under article 13 of the statutes, it is incumbent upon each national group to designate, at least 1 month before the opening of the session, 2 of its members to sit on the Council, and to make known their names to the Interparliamentary Bureau, which will communicate them to the Conference.

DECISIONS TAKEN BY THE INTER-PARLIAMENTARY COUNCIL AT NICE, ON APRIL 24, 1949, AT ROME, ON APRIL 17, 1955, AND AT GENEVA, ON MARCH 30, 1958 WITH REGARD TO INTER-PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCES

I. Debates

A. The general debate on the report of the secretary general shall remain unchanged. If necessary, a conference may hold 1 or 2 night sittings for the general debate. After the discussions, the secretary general shall reply to the remarks which have been made concerning the activity of the Inter-Parliamentary Union.

B. Not more than 2 representatives of each delegation may speak in the general debate, and only after 1 member from each delegation desiring to speak has been heard. In view of the increase in the number of national groups and the multiplicity of questions which figure in the agenda, the Inter-Parliamentary Council decided to allow each national group during the general debate a maximum speaking time of 15 minutes if there are 2 speakers from the same group. If there is 1 speaker, he will be allowed 10 minutes only.

C. As regards other items in the agenda, the number of speakers is similarly limited to two per group. Each delegation has a maximum speaking time of 15 minutes if there are 2 speakers from the same group. If there is 1 speaker, he will be allowed 10 minutes only.

II. Languages used

A. Speeches in French or English shall normally be translated into the other language by the official interpreters engaged for the conference.

B. As an exceptional measure, a delegate may make use of a language other than French or English at inter-parliamentary meetings, provided that he arranges for the services of an interpreter capable of summarizing his remarks in French or English.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, during the general debate in the first few days of the conference, an outstanding address was given by the Right Honorable Herbert Morrison, of Great Britain. Because his address set forth the position of Great Britain, I have headed it "The British Position." It was a statement of more than usual significance. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BRITISH POSITION

(General debate by the Right Honorable Herbert Morrison of Great Britain)

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, the British delegation, with other delegations, would wish to thank our colleagues of Brazil for the organization of the conference and for the splendid hospitality which they have extended to us. We watched on television the football match between Brazil and Sweden, it was a great match and I must congratulate Brazil on being able to play football and the Swedes for the very fine fight which they put up. The Brazilians never lost sight of the ball, they were always on top of it and that is probably a good lesson for parliamentarians.

The General Secretary's report is a very admirable one. Obviously he has sought to be fair and impartial. He is to be congratulated upon it, but it is a sad report telling of troubles which have emerged in various parts of the world, attempts to reach compromises and not always succeeding. It is a regrettable story of what I think are often needless troubles in the world.

When the second great war ended it appeared to me then and it appears to me still to be an easy matter for the peace of the world to be taken care of if every country which joined the United Nations and accepted its charter acted up to the principles embodied in the charter. Moreover, I think that as the United States, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, and France had been allies in the war, these great powers if they cooperated genuinely in the United Nations could take care of the peace of the world, and therefore these disturbances, these defiance are really quite unnecessary. Nothing can be more simple for the peace of the world to be protected than if there were genuine cooperation between these powers as well as the other countries within the United Nations. They could take care of the peace of the world, but what is happening now is what happened in the League of Nations. You can make a United Nations' organization, you can keep it going and let it have its meetings, but if one great power will not play the game by the United Nations then the United Nations cannot do its work properly.

17132

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 19

In the case of the League of Nations before the war there was a great power, Nazi Germany, which would not cooperate and she was supported by the then Governments in Italy and Japan. Nazi Germany made it impossible for the League of Nations to work properly and unfortunately the democracies were not sufficiently cooperating with each other to act collectively for protecting the peace of the world.

Now, unfortunately, I am bound to say that a nation which is impeding the effectiveness of the United Nations is a very great nation with which all of us wish to live in peace, namely, the Soviet Union. I remember how earnestly Ernest Bevin tried to cooperate with the Soviet Union and after 2 years he came to the conclusion that their cooperation was not forthcoming. If only the Soviet Union could definitely cooperate with the democratic countries of the world, if only she would give up ideas about spreading communism throughout the world (which is bound to make other people apprehensive), if only there were genuine cooperation on the part of the great Soviet Union, then peace could be secure and the word of the United Nations operative. But if there is one great power which is out of step, which will not cooperate, then the United Nations cannot properly work.

Let me assure the representatives of the Soviet Union and other Communist countries that there is no political party in Britain which would make an aggressive attack upon the Soviet Union or the other Communist countries. [Applause.] Indeed, if any British Government tried to make an aggression against the Soviet Union that Government would not survive. I assure the Soviet delegates therefore from the bottom of my heart that they can assure the people of their great country that there is no possibility of an aggression by Britain against the Soviet Union.

I believe the same can be said about the United States. It is true that their language is sometimes a bit rougher than ours but, after all, Mr. Khrushchev can use rough language too. Sometimes he is very nice and sometimes he is not very nice. You must allow for the fact that the English of the United States is sometimes a bit different from the English of Britain. They speak English but it is somewhat different.

I do not believe an American Government could survive if it went in for aggression against the Soviet Union. If anything they were slow to participate in the Second World War, which I think they should have been in at the beginning on the ground that it was a war about the American way of life, but they did not come in until they were attacked, and in the First World War they did not come in early at all, so that the tradition of the United States is to keep out of wars. There is mischiefmaking going on to the contrary and it is a pity.

With regard to the Middle East the British Labor Party took the view that the sending of American and British troops to the Middle East was wrong. They took the view that the matter should have been dealt with by the United Nations, as they took that view on the Suez difficulty earlier.

Indeed, they argue that it is difficult for us to say that Russia was wrong in relation to Hungary, which we think she was, but the Russian defense is that they were invited to intervene by the Hungarian Government and our defense of going to Jordan and the Americans going to Lebanon is that we were invited to go by the two Governments and so it is a little difficult to argue, says the British Labor Party, that the defense of the Russians was wrong in the case of Hungary and right in the case of ourselves.

On the other hand, the Russians cannot argue that it was right to do what they did in Hungary in accepting the alleged invitation of the Hungarian Government and that it is

wrong for the British and Americans modestly to accept the invitation of Lebanon and Jordan. So the British Labor Party was critical of the Government although the later debate in our Parliament indicated that the two parties are agreed in accepting the idea of a summit meeting tied up with the Security Council which we hope will work out and do good.

Do not let it be ignored that the old British imperialism is dead; we are struggling to train the people of the colonial dependencies, as they were, for self-government, and some for independence, whilst others are treating their colonies in a very different way—and I am talking about European colonies.

The old British imperialism is dead, but a new imperialism is evolving which sometimes gets its way by war but usually by political scheming, sometimes by assassinations. When a country wants to spread its power over a whole region without the consent of the other countries, it seems to me imperialism, even if it is imperialism of a new sort, and therefore I think that the policy which President Nasser of Egypt has followed is one which is calculated to disturb the peace in the Middle East and is not a good neighbor policy. The threats to destroy Israel, which is a progressive country in the Middle East are quite unnecessary. Israel wishes to live at peace with its neighbors and to make the peace which has been so long delayed.

The Middle East could be rich, it could be much more prosperous and I would appeal to them to adopt the suggestion I made when I was at the Foreign Office, namely, that there should be cooperation between all the countries of the Middle East with, if they wish it, cooperation with the Western countries by the setting up of a social and economic board, which would undertake to use the oil revenues for the economic and cultural development of the middle eastern countries. They could be much more prosperous. It is this method of advancing economic and social welfare, transport and other matters in underdeveloped countries such as this, which is far the best way to develop the peace and contentment of the peoples of these countries.

I wish to make a personal appeal to the delegates here—we are very pleased to see them—from the Soviet Union and countries associated with them; they are here as Parliamentarians, they are taking part, quite properly, in our debates. I beg of them to go back to the Soviet Parliament and to speak up and to say that their impression of this conference is that nobody here intends or desires to make any aggression against the Soviet Union, that we all feel that these enormous sums of money which are being spent on armaments and, indeed part of the large sums of money which are being spent on science and upon heavy industry are, in their way preparations to develop a war machine, could be saved.

Most of it could be saved and could be used for the improvement of the standard of life of the masses of the people in our countries including the peoples of the Soviet Union whose standard of life is improving although there is still much room for improvement.

So I say to our Russian colleagues and the others associated with them to go back to your Parliaments, where they ought to parley, to talk, to argue. It is not healthy for Parliamentary life that Parliament should be run by the government coming along with a policy or a decree, and Parliament forthwith holding up its hands and agreeing. Criticism of government is healthy, no government should be free of criticism (agreed and applause). When I was in the British Labour Government we had a lot of criticism, including some from my conservative

colleagues here today, but we survived it, it did us good.

I would not wish to belong to a government which nobody criticizes, so, my Soviet friends, go back to your country, stand up and preach this gospel of cooperation and peace and assure them from the Inter-Parliamentary Union that Soviet Union is safe from aggression. There is nothing we want more than genuine cooperation on their part for the peace and progress of the world.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The other position which was set forth in the general debate, and which had a great deal of interest because of the so-called cold war and the clash of opinion in the world today, was set forth by Mr. Paletskis, of the Russian delegation. I have headed his address the Russian Position as Given in the General Debate. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE RUSSIAN POSITION AS GIVEN IN GENERAL DEBATE

(Speech by Mr. Paletskis (U. R. S. S.), July 25, 1958)

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, we have gathered here with a view to help in promoting peace the world over. It is exactly this that the lofty aim of the Inter-Parliamentary Union consists in. Peoples expect from us deeds and not words. However, some of the Parliamentarians here, our British colleague among them, were just indulging in pathetic phraseology.

Mr. Morrisson gave us assurance of the good feelings entertained by the English people toward the peoples of the U. S. S. R. We have not the slightest doubt about this. Unfortunately, bitter historical facts show that between the kind feelings of the English people and certain actions of the British Government there exists a great disparity.

I shall recall that from the first days of the inception of our State it was the English Government that took the initiative in waging an armed struggle against the Soviet Union. The English delegate reminded us of our common struggle against Hitler Germany. Nobody can deny the great contribution made by the English people in that struggle. But even in the days of war, actions of the English Government did not accord with the genuine sentiments of the English people.

No sooner had the guns stopped firing, as Mr. Churchill, according to his own words, gave orders to collect weapons for a war against the Soviet Union. We could remind about some other facts when unworthy deeds were being made under the coverage of parliamentary criticism. It is generally known that fully justified criticism was voiced in the House of Commons against the policy of the Government in the Middle East. But this did not prevent the ruling circles from starting the Suez adventure in 1956, or from joining the American intervention in the Near and Middle East in 1958.

We have different views with some of our western colleagues in respect of criticism and its influence on governments. As to the Soviet Government, it is guided in its activities solely by the interests of the people and exercises its will. That is why the Soviet Government unilaterally suspended nuclear-weapons tests. Such was its reaction to the demands of the people. Why the Parliaments of the United States and Great Britain did not press upon their Governments the discontinuation of such tests?

Now, which criticism is more effective?

1958

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

17133

Just a few words about the so-called Communist imperialism. To talk about it means intentionally to distort the truth. And the truth is that there are two systems in the present world. Ideas of communism are not subject to export. They master the minds of people and triumph, no matter whether some people may like it or not. On the other hand, the American and English imperialism are trying to save the rotten-through colonial system by resorting to force.

Gentlemen, American and English parliamentarians, we request you to inform your colleagues in your countries that the Soviet Union does not threaten anybody. It wants to export not communism but goods, because it stands for a peaceful competition of the two systems. Our Government and Parliament have repeatedly proposed to make a decisive step from the present lack of confidence and suspicions to mutual understanding and cooperation. Let our colleagues from Western countries hear our appeal. The cause of peace will only profit by this.

Some people wonder at our insistence and the sharp language we use when we present our stand on this point. But when peace is at stake, when the very destiny of humanity is threatened, can one stay a passive looker-on of those dreadful developments?

The American and British troops in the Arab countries are not mythical "flying saucers," they are not whales mistaken for submarines, they are not meteorites on the screens of radar installations because of which American generals are sending squadrons of H-bomb carriers toward the frontiers of our country.

We have never suffered from nervous collapses but we have had plenty of bitter experience so as not to be concerned with the fate of mankind. Where would be the composure of our colleagues from the United States, had the events been reversed and it were not the United States troops which landed on the coast of the Mediterranean, but the troops of some European or Asian country that staged a landing on the coast of the American Continent?

One cannot remain indifferent to what is happening in the NATO-controlled zone, where former generals of Hitler are being given atomic weapons, that is, just the kind of weapons Hitler himself dreamed of. It is easy to imagine what would have remained of Europe and what course the history would have taken if the cannibal Hitler had had means of mass destruction in his hands.

It is our profound belief that there are no aims that can justify the use of nuclear weapons. Neither political nor economic or ideological interests of the Soviet Union, and this is true about other countries of the Socialist camp, make the armaments race and the possession of nuclear weapons imperative for the interests of our country. Those who need A- and H-bombs, those who fear disarmament and the prohibition of nuclear weapons are revealing their own political, economic, and ideological bankruptcy and are striving to world supremacy based on force and arbitrariness.

If we seek the views of all the nations and conduct a worldwide referendum on the suppression of nuclear weapons there is not even the slightest doubt that the absolute majority of mankind will vote for their complete suppression as well as for the elimination of A-bomb stockpiles. Humanity, to be sure, would like to see the whole of the globe an atom-free zone.

Humanity wants to see power politics substituted by "sense politics" and "well-being politics" so that instead of balancing on the "brink of war" international relations are built up on the solid rock of peaceful coexistence, so that instead of the policy of "cold war" we pursue a policy of genuine friendship among all the nations, a policy of peace throughout the world.

When atom-threats are bandied about, when destruction is called for all honest people feel indignant, but when an American youth Van Kliburn conquers Moscow and Leningrad, and the Moyseev dance ensemble takes Washington and New York by storm, when the football players of Brazil get the world crown for their excellent display in the football fields, everybody is rejoicing and happy.

One of the reasons that causes international tension is vicious misinformation, freedom for lies and slanders, disseminated with a view to fanning war hysteria. These are the elements of the myth of what they call in the West the Iron Curtain.

It is most unfortunate that some speakers thought fit to use the platform of this conference for setting forth on the myth of the so-called Communist menace, slandering the policy of the Soviet Union. The bogus of the Communist menace has been always used to smokescreen the true aims of imperialism and reaction. I would like to remind to some of these gentlemen that it was due to the strength of the Soviet Union and the victory of the Soviet Army and its allies that their own countries were freed from Nazi enslavement, and it was due to these factors that their own independence and freedom were saved.

The 47th Inter-Parliamentary Conference which has been convened at such a strenuous moment must take a firm stand against any form of war-mongering, must go on record as a champion of peace.

We, representatives of the peoples of the Soviet Union, are happy to have this opportunity to pay a call to Brazil, a country which is so beautiful and rich in natural resources, the peoples of which are so industrious and endowed with so many talents. There is no doubt that the United States of Brazil, one of the greatest countries of the globe, must play an important role in world politics.

The speech of His Excellency the President of the Brazilian Republic Mr. Kubitschek de Oliveira permits us to rest assured that the ever growing influence of Brazil would be aimed at strengthening peace, for the good and prosperity of humanity.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. By way of emphasis, I may say that Mr. Morrison concluded his significant statement with these words:

I would not wish to belong to a government which nobody criticizes, so, my Soviet friends, go back to your country, stand up and preach the gospel of cooperation and peace, and assure them, from the Interparliamentary Union, that the Soviet Union is safe from aggression. There is nothing we want more than genuine cooperation on their part for the peace and progress of the world.

More or less in response to that statement, I suppose, Mr. Paletskis, the spokesman for the Russian delegation, responded:

Gentlemen, American and English parliamentarians, we request you to inform your colleagues and your countries that the Soviet Union does not threaten anybody.

I cite those two points of view in juxtaposition, because throughout the conference there had been evidence of the cold war, yet apparently there was on the part of the representatives from the several parliamentary bodies a desire somehow to bridge the gap and to find some basis for arriving at agreements and understandings.

I mentioned earlier that a number of the delegates were women. One of the outstanding addresses of the conference

was given by a delegate from Turkey, Miss Nuriye Pinar.

I shall ask unanimous consent to have her remarks printed in the RECORD, but first I wish to read two paragraphs from her very well presented address.

All nations want peace; all the governments also pretend that they want peace. But the passion or the whim of a man in power may easily cause the world to flare up. We have had plenty of examples of this.

I am addressing myself, therefore, to women, to my colleagues who represent their peoples in parliament, and especially to women who share with men political power. I appeal to these women to prevent men from following their passions, from sending our children to the hell of war, from hurting humanity, and from letting mankind degenerate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Miss Pinar's address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A WOMAN'S POINT OF VIEW

(Speech of Deputy Miss Nuriye Pinar, of the Turkish delegation, delivered on July 28, 1958)

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentleman, we are very happy to participate in this 47th conference of the Interparliamentary Union in Rio de Janeiro, one of the most beautiful cities in the world.

At the same time we regret to be unable to devote ourselves more fully to the enjoyment of the beauties of nature and of the amiability of the Brazilian people. For under the present conditions we are divided into two parts: our hearts are far away in our country, whereas with our heads we are here. Yes, Mr. Chairman, my country Turkey is surrounded by dark clouds through which it is difficult to see; yet it is and will always remain basking in sunshine. Thank God, Turkey will never be swallowed by darkness, she will always do her best that that does not happen.

This 47th conference will be of historic importance in two senses: it coincides with the conflict in the Middle East, and, secondly, being held in Rio, it gives the whole of Latin America an international importance and responsibility.

We Turks are certain that Latin America will be of great help for safeguarding peace. All nations want peace; all the governments also pretend that they want peace. But the passion or the whim of a man in power may easily cause the world to flare up. We have had plenty of examples of this.

I am addressing myself therefore to women; to my colleagues who represent their peoples in parliament, and especially to women who share with men political power. I appeal to these women to prevent men from following their passions, from sending our children to the hell of war, from hurting humanity and from letting mankind degenerate.

Let them leave man alone, for he is a poor creature; leave him to his own troubles and difficulties, to fight for life.

Let us remind them that man who uses force will never be loved and will always be betrayed.

Tell the men that they must never forget the past and that history repeats itself.

Since its constitution 35 years ago, democracy Turkey has given many proofs of its pacific policy. After the war of independence, Ataturk, to the astonishment of the world, signed a treaty of friendship with Greece in order to bring about the Balkan Pact. During the Second World War Turkey has done its best to stop the conflagration from spreading. Now the government de-

17134

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 19

votes all its efforts towards raising the welfare of the people; it has always acted in the same way when international welfare was at stake. In 1950, Turkey did not hesitate for a moment and sent its children to Korea to assure international peace and to come to the aid of the suffering brave Koreans.

How can we make peace secure? In my opinion total peace will never prevail on this earth, just as complete peace can never reign in a family. We women want to make certain that incidents of disagreement among nations do not surpass the limits of family quarrels, because we want to consider the world as one big family, with good boys and bad boys.

From a realistic point of view, absolute disarmament is impossible. But even so, no government has the right to inflict total and mass destruction on humanity. I want to speak of nuclear arms which are being manufactured at a blind pace.

It is absolutely necessary for all States to come to an agreement concerning the control of nuclear arms, for an atomic war means the total destruction or decay of mankind. Yes, my dear colleagues, atomic energy provides for mass killing, but because of its irradiations it also has most harmful effects on nature. Thus in this age which in the geological jargon I will call the atomic age, when human intelligence has reached its acme, we want to bring about the degeneration and decay of mankind.

Believe me that this development has been taking place in history at a very slow pace.

We may kill, but we have no right to let men degenerate and lead an even more miserable existence than now.

Each nation has its difficulties. No nation is completely satisfied with its government. Why then allow so much money to be spent on a purely destructive aim?

No, women want a gay, a happier world, without fear for the present and without worries for the future.

Women want to leave their children behind them in a loyal and prosperous world, and they hope that the progress achieved in the technical field will be achieved also in the moral sphere.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, as the central theme of the conference, the representatives of the parliamentary bodies sought a way to peace and understanding so as to avoid war. Each member of the delegation was assigned to a committee.

I can only speak with reference to the action of the committee to which I was assigned; but because it was one of the committees which had this central theme in mind, I shall take a few minutes to review its deliberations.

I was assigned to the Committee on the Strengthening of Peace. The resolution which was considered by our committee had been developed at a preconference session held at Geneva last spring, at which the United States was represented by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROWE]. Draft resolutions were presented for each of the major topics on which the conference deliberated.

The Committee on the Strengthening of Peace had 2 major fields for its resolution. One was the problem of disarmament; the other was the creation of an international police force.

Mr. President, I shall ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record draft resolutions on the subjects of the reduction of armaments, par-

ticularly the problem of atomic weapons and nuclear tests, and the establishment of an international police force.

In that connection, I shall dwell a little upon the draft resolution and the amendments proposed, because they bear so much on the questions which are at issue in the United Nations and on the public opinion in the world at this time.

The Russian delegation and its supporters sought consistently to have some resolutions adopted by the Conference which would imply some criticism of the action of the United States in sending troops to Lebanon, and of the British in sending troops to Jordan. The Russians also sought the adoption of amendments to the draft resolutions which would, on the one hand, commend the Soviet Union for its announcement that it had suspended nuclear tests, and, by the same token, an amendment which would condemn the continuation of tests by any other country, regardless of whether those tests had been concluded this year or not.

Their amendments on this subject were generally defeated in the committee by a vote of 7 or 9 yeas to 12 or 14 nays, with some abstentions. I may say that the voting strength of the Conference as a whole was approximately 550 votes. It varied somewhat if there were a few absences. The voting of the several delegations bore a relationship to the membership of the parliamentary bodies at home. For example, each country began with 8 votes, but those were added to by additional votes for the size of the parliamentary bodies.

The vote of the United States delegation was 21, and the Russians had a vote of 22—both of which reflected the size of the respective parliamentary bodies.

But approximately 25 to 30 countries were represented at all times in the committee dealing with the strengthening of peace; and the votes cast on all the amendments ranged from approximately 21 to 29.

I think possibly the best way for me to present the report is to request unanimous consent that the votes on the amendments to the draft resolution be printed at this point in the Record, together with my personal notations on the vote on each amendment. In printing the votes it will not be necessary to repeat the heading in each case; it will suffice to indicate that four amendments were offered to the first portion of the draft resolution. If the text of each one—namely, the one submitted by the Indonesian delegation; the one submitted by Mr. Kriegel-Valrimont, of France; the one submitted by the Czechoslovak delegation; and the one submitted by Mr. Jacques de Maupeou, of France—is inserted at this point in the Record, following the printing of the draft resolution, together with my notations on each of the amendments. I believe such a printing of them in the Record will be valuable for reference purposes. I so request, Mr. President.

There being no objection, the draft resolution and amendments were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE STRENGTHENING OF PEACE

(A) THE PROBLEM OF ATOMIC WEAPONS AND NUCLEAR TESTS

(Draft resolution presented, in the name of the Committee on Reduction of Armaments, by Col. Tufton Beamish, Member of Parliament (Great Britain))

The 47th Interparliamentary Conference—
Conscious of the overwhelming desire of all peoples for an honorable and lasting settlement of the grave differences that intensify distrust, anxiety and tension between nations,

Believing that the continuing accumulation of armaments of all types, nuclear and conventional, represents a serious threat to security and peace, and

Noting the profound concern of the peoples of the world about the continuing nuclear weapons tests,

Believing also that nuclear energy should be developed exclusively for peaceful purposes,

Taking into consideration the urgent necessity of eliminating all harmful consequences of nuclear tests for human life and health,

Stressing the great responsibility for the people's future which rests with the parliaments of various states and with the Interparliamentary Union,

Recalling the resolution adopted unanimously by the 45th Interparliamentary Conference at Bangkok in 1956,

Reaffirming in particular the belief that, pending the conclusion of a comprehensive disarmament agreement, including measures of conventional and nuclear disarmament and the reduction of armed forces under effective international inspection and control, attention should be given to the possibility of agreeing on the first installment of internationally controlled disarmament which could be put into effect with the least possible delay,

Deeply regretting that no resolution containing proposals which were in harmony with that belief, submitted to the 12th regular session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, commanded unanimous support,

Taking into account also that the cessation of nuclear tests might slow the arms race and would further a solution of the entire problem of disarmament,

Appeals urgently to parliaments of all states members of the IPU to recommend to governments in the strongest possible terms that speedy action be taken to secure the resumption of disarmament negotiations, preferable within the framework of the United Nations, and that one of the most urgent aims of such negotiations should be to secure without delay the cessation, under proper international control, of nuclear weapons tests.

(B) THE POSSIBILITY OF ESTABLISHING AN INTERNATIONAL POLICE FORCE

(Draft resolution presented, in the name of the Committee on Reduction of Armaments by Mr. Jacques de Maupeou, Senator (France))

The 47th Interparliamentary Conference—
Believing that the institution of a permanent international police force charged with the tasking of insuring collective security is highly desirable,

Is of the opinion that the establishment of such a force should be effected under the aegis of the United Nations;

And urgently appeals to all parliaments represented within the union to recommend that their respective governments take all possible steps to establish an international police force on a permanent basis.

Aye 12, nay 8, absentions 7.

1958

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

17135

THE STRENGTHENING OF PEACE

(A) THE PROBLEM OF ATOMIC WEAPONS AND NUCLEAR TESTS

(Amendment submitted by the Indonesian delegation)

The last paragraph to be amended as follows:

"Appeals urgently to Parliaments of all States members of the IPU to recommend to Governments, in the strongest possible terms, that speedy action be taken to secure the resumption of disarmament negotiations, and that such negotiations should be to secure—

"1. the cessation of nuclear tests without delay;

"2. (a) the total prohibition and manufacture of nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction of every type; (b) the conversion of existing stocks of nuclear weapons for peaceful purposes;

"3. the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes only;

"4. the establishment of effective international control to guarantee the effective observance of these agreements as well as the agreement relating to conventional armaments."

Aye 9, no 14, abstentions 3.

THE STRENGTHENING OF PEACE

(A) THE PROBLEM OF ATOMIC WEAPONS AND NUCLEAR TESTS

(Amendment submitted by Mr. Maurice Kriegel-Valrimont (France))

1. Modify the title to read: "The Problem of Atomic Weapons, Nuclear Tests and the Guarantee of the Peace Now Threatened."

2. Add to the text the following paragraphs:

"Considering the extreme gravity of the international situation,

"Believing that peace can only be safeguarded on the basis of the recognition of the right of self-determination for the Arab peoples as for all other peoples,

"Demands that immediate and efficacious measures be taken to guarantee peace in the Near and Middle East."

Aye 7, no 20, abstentions 1.

THE STRENGTHENING OF PEACE

(A) THE PROBLEM OF ATOMIC WEAPONS AND NUCLEAR TESTS

(Amendment presented by the Czechoslovak delegation)

Add, after the words, "Taking into account also that the cessation of nuclear tests might slow the arms race and would further a solution of the entire problem of disarmament," a new paragraph as follows:

"Noting the significance of the decision taken by the Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R. for the unilateral suspension of all kinds of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests in the Soviet Union as a step of historical importance for the consolidation of international peace and security."

Aye 7, No 21, absentions 1.

THE STRENGTHENING OF PEACE

(B) THE POSSIBILITY OF ESTABLISHING AN INTERNATIONAL POLICE FORCE

(Amendment submitted by Mr. Jacques de Maupeou (France))

Delete the word "and" at the beginning of paragraph 3 and add a fourth paragraph as follows:

"And invites the Inter-Parliamentary Council to set up, within the Union, a sub-committee or study group with the task of preparing a plan which might eventually lead to the creation of such a force."

Aye 9, nay 10, absentions 2.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, in the committee, when the final vote came on the first section of

the draft resolution—that dealing with atomic weapons and nuclear tests—it received a unanimous vote. That resolution concluded with an appeal to the parliaments of all states who are members of the Interparliamentary Union to recommend to their governments, in the strongest possible terms, that speedy action be taken to secure the resumption of disarmament negotiations, preferably within the framework of the United Nations, and that one of the most urgent aims of such negotiations should be to secure without delay the cessation, under proper international control, of nuclear-weapons tests.

That vote was very important. The representatives of the Iron Curtain countries tried to add to the resolution in one way or another. But after noting that the United Nations had suspended the work of its disarmament committee, the resolution of the Interparliamentary Union recommends that the disarmament negotiations be resumed, and the resolution calls for the nations to cease, under proper international control, nuclear-weapons tests. On that, the vote was a significant one; and personally I was glad to see it receive a unanimous vote.

However, following that vote, the leaders of the Russian delegation and its representative on this particular committee stated that there would not be a unanimous vote on the second part of the resolution—that dealing with the establishment of an International Police Force.

The draft resolution proposed that all Parliaments represented within the Union recommend that their respective governments take all possible steps to establish an International Police Force on a permanent basis, under the aegis of the United Nations. Within the committee, the portion of the resolution dealing with the maintenance of peace or the strengthening of peace received 12 yeas, 8 nay votes, with 7 abstentions. In other words, the abstentions, plus the negative votes, totaled 15, whereas the yeas totaled 12.

However, when the resolution was presented to the Conference, at the time when the committee reported, the draft resolution received 371 yeas, 104 nays, with 50 abstentions. In other words, the Conference as a whole voted in favor—by a ratio of more than 3 to 1—of the draft resolution relating to the establishment of an International Police Force.

I think that vote was a significant one, because now, as we know, the United Nations is about to consider the proposal of the President of the United States that an International Police Force be created to deal with the problems in the Middle East.

The fact that the parliamentary bodies' representatives voted, by a ratio of more than 3 to 1, in favor of that, I believe is auspicious, and perhaps should be of benefit to the delegates to the United Nations who are representing the executive branches of their governments, in showing that the parliamentary representatives voted in favor of that resolution.

In addition to serving on committees, members of the delegations were invited to participate in the making of speeches at the conference sessions, which might be compared roughly with the sessions of the Senate; and the committee sessions, of course, corresponded to the meetings of Senate committees.

In the assignment of duties pertaining to the Conference sessions, it was my privilege to participate by making an address entitled "The Right of the People To Know the Truth." That address was made at the session held on the subject of "Cultural Exchanges Between Countries and Freedom of Information."

Representative Boggs, of Louisiana, also spoke during that session; his remarks were on the subject of Freedom of Information, as were mine.

In view of the fact that the cultural exchanges between countries and freedom of information have such a basic function to play in developing international understanding, I ask unanimous consent that the summary record No. 9 for the ninth sitting of the Conference on Tuesday afternoon, July 29, 1958, be printed at this point in the Record, together with the résumé of the speeches delivered at that session.

There being no objection, the summary record was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

FORTY-SEVENTH INTERPARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE, JULY 24 TO AUGUST 1, 1958—SUMMARY RECORD No. 9, TUESDAY, JULY 29, 1958, AFTERNOON, NINTH SITTING

The sitting was opened at 3 p. m. in the Chamber of Deputies with Mr. Pham-van-Nhu (Vietnam), vice president, in the chair. CULTURAL EXCHANGE BETWEEN COUNTRIES AND FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

Documents: Reports in the names of the Committees on Intellectual Relations and Juridical questions, presented by Mme. Lébédéva, Deputy (U. S. S. R.), and Mr. Grégoire, Deputy (Luxembourg). Draft resolutions presented in the name of the Committee on Intellectual Relations by Mr. Nothomb, Senator (Belgium), and in the names of the Committees on Intellectual, Relations, and Juridical Questions by Mr. Grégoire, Deputy (Luxembourg).

The conference was addressed by M. de Laurentie, of UNESCO, on behalf of Dr. Luther H. Evans, Director General of UNESCO.

M. de Laurentie expressed Dr. Evans' regret at his inability to attend the conference.

He said that the member states which founded UNESCO declared their common agreement upon developing and increasing means of cultural exchange between peoples. It appeared to UNESCO that those who had been elected by their peoples were specially qualified to assist in the implementation of that program. He expressed UNESCO's support for the draft resolutions, which he felt would strengthen the considerable action which had already been undertaken by Parliaments in increasing means of international exchanges. UNESCO's support was warm, and once the resolutions were adopted, UNESCO would be glad to support any efforts which might be made to carry them out.

The debates of the Interparliamentary Union and the debates of the United Nations formed for the time being the basis for an international agreement regarding the political aspects of freedom of exchange of information, which was a difficult thing to achieve owing to the differences of view which

existed in the world. While the present valuable and interesting exchanges of view continued, many millions of people throughout the world were deprived of the right to obtain information simply because physical means of disseminating information were lacking. It was discouraging to realize that in the present century, when methods of communication had progressed so astonishingly, about 100 countries did not possess an adequate network of press, wireless and cinema, covering a mass of many millions of people. The situation was such that only international initiative could achieve a solution. All the agencies of the United Nations, UNESCO in particular, were extremely keen to support the organization of exchange of information, but in the last analysis success must depend upon the action of governments themselves. It behooved governments to make available the necessary sums so that an adequate program could be arranged to provide information for the vast masses of the world who were at present without it. It was unnecessary to stress what the effect of that would be upon the economic and social progress of the countries so aided. The draft resolutions showed that the Interparliamentary Union shared the anxieties and hopes of UNESCO in that respect. Freedom of information was not an abstract subject. It was a right which must be conferred upon all human beings, together with all material means which were necessary to the achievement of that objective.

He gave details of the work at present being carried out by UNESCO in connection with the provision of multilateral and bilateral agreements for cultural exchange and for the exchange of official and unofficial publications and the provision of information and documentation for national institutions as well as conferences of nongovernmental and intergovernmental organizations. He referred to UNESCO's part in organizing in 1955 a meeting of directors of national cultural services, a meeting which would be repeated this year. UNESCO was also concerned with student exchanges. By giving publicity to many problems, UNESCO encouraged the initiative of states in making exchange agreements. UNESCO supported many bilateral programs in the field of science, and it did a great deal of technical assistance. All of this led to happier relations between peoples and to further cultural exchange developments.

The movement had started but it must be supported and speeded up, for it was only by intensifying the present effort that it would be possible to achieve the great objectives which were sought. From that point of view, UNESCO gave its full support to the draft resolutions. He wished the Inter-Parliamentary Union success in its work.

Mrs. Lebedeva (U. S. S. R.) (Rapporteur) said that two reports had been presented on cultural agreements, one by Mr. Iribarne (Spain) and one by herself. She referred to the development of international cultural relations since the war. There had been cultural agreements between states with different social and political systems, for example that of January 27, 1958, between the U. S. S. R. and the United States of America. Mr. Khrushchev, in his message to President Eisenhower, had stated that this agreement was a practical step toward the rapprochement of the two countries.

In recent years cultural exchanges had encompassed the whole world, and this was of particular importance for the countries of Asia and Africa. Various forms of cultural links played an immense role in the creation of mutual understanding between the peoples of different countries, for nothing could give a more profound and clearer insight into the spiritual life of a country than a knowledge of its culture. The basic factor which provided for the strengthening of cultural exchanges was respect for national sov-

eighty and observation of the principle of noninterference in the affairs of other countries.

The militarization of science as a result of the armaments race diverted its best forces to the creation of more powerful means of destruction. Hundreds of thousands of talented workers were engaged in working out more effective means of killing people. Ever louder sounded the appeals of scientists in all countries who wanted an agreement amongst States on a complete transfer of research work to peaceful purposes. Discussions on cultural cooperation might play an important role in the consolidation of the ideas of peaceful coexistence and in lessening international tension.

Social progress, the surging development of science, technology, and culture and the unprecedented opening up of peoples' social consciousness had multiplied international contacts in many ways. Hence the necessity to regulate these contacts and place them on a solid juridical basis. In 1955, 450,000 foreigners had visited the United States of America and in 1957, 550,000 foreigners had visited the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Unfortunately, in some countries passports were still being denied to such people as actors, singers, and various sportsmen.

Mr. Grégoire (Luxembourg) (Rapporteur) said that whenever he visited a foreign country he read its newspapers to assess the degree of freedom which existed and he found that the quality of the information given was in direct proportion to the measure of freedom accorded to journalists and public opinion. It was said that freedom of thought and speech was a right which was universally recognized, but it must be borne in mind that this right had two facets, the active and the passive. One facet related to the freedom to give information and the other related to the person who was to be informed. Such a person should have at his disposal all the facts necessary to form his own opinion.

Sometimes one had the impression, in discussing these questions, that it was necessary to define the true meaning of the terms used. For instance, there were several opinions on the meaning of the right to free access to sources of information. To some people freedom was an open space within which it was possible for them to do and say what they liked, while for others it was a closed cage in which they could do only what they were told. When discussing freedom of information they had to remember that objectivity of information was also necessary.

There were natural restrictions upon the freedom of information, but he did not think anyone was entitled to go beyond those natural restrictions and to introduce intellectual restrictions. He pointed out that it was possible in a newspaper to state a fact which of itself was true but yet to give an incorrect picture by not presenting it in its context. The reader must be presented with all the facts necessary for him to make up his own mind. Some omissions were involuntary, but others were deliberate, and these he strongly condemned.

Side by side with traditional means of information there were such modern means as wireless and television. Freedom to inform presupposed freedom to dispose of the means of information. There was an opinion that broadcasting and television were distinct from other techniques of information, but he did not accept this point of view.

He asked the Argentine group not to press their amendment, which contained nothing which was not already in the draft resolution, and he opposed the Soviet group amendment which, he said, went beyond the meaning of the draft resolution.

Mr. Iribarne (Spain) said that cultural relations had achieved such an importance in the world that it was necessary to estab-

lish an outline plan so that the objective might be secured in the interests of peace and better understanding between people. It was for this purpose that UNESCO was created as an indispensable collaborator with the United Nations. Cultural relations could be achieved only through legislation in the countries concerned. The countries which were asked to ratify cultural agreements must be generous and not reject them for futile reasons, as unfortunately happened sometimes. Firm criteria must be established to permit the development of cultural relations. He supported Mrs. Lebedeva and urged the assembly to approve the resolutions.

Mrs. Ablazova (U. S. S. R.) said that the fact that cultural contacts existed was an indication of the feasibility of peaceful coexistence between nations. She gave details of contacts between Soviet and foreign scientists, teachers, actors, writers, and artists in the recent past, stating that they contributed to world peace.

The draft resolution was evidence of the desire of the Interparliamentary Union to encourage international cultural ties, and there was no doubt that activities by parliamentarians in accordance with the principles of the resolution would promote peace and international cooperation.

Mothers all over the world desired peace on earth so that their children could be happy. They wanted their children to be intelligent, energetic, sociable, and diligent and to love good books, songs, and music. Above all, they wanted their children to grow up in an atmosphere of peace and friendship and to love man so that they were imbued with humane sentiments from early childhood. As a mother and a teacher, she was a champion of peace.

Mr. Weidmann (Argentina), referring to the Argentine amendment (Lib. presse/Am. 2), spoke of the first measures taken in the Argentine to establish freedom of communication. A famous writer had stated that freedom of expression and freedom of association were the fundamentals of a democratic government. Without free elections, people could not choose their policies, and without freedom of speech, no right could exist, and that was the basis of democracy. The freedom of expression, exercised through all the techniques now placed at the disposal of man, such as the press, books, wireless, television, the theater and public meetings, was absolutely essential to the very nature of a democratic state. Without it, a democratic state could not exist, for there must be opportunity for people to criticize and to control the activities of those who governed them. Indeed, those who governed could not carry out their duties if public opinion could not be expressed.

Mr. Dang-hieu-Khan (Vietnam) said that the peoples of democracies claimed the right to be informed, and the right to be objectively informed. The right to be informed meant that the people must have at their disposal all the means required for providing them with the necessary information, such as wireless, television, press agencies, reading rooms and facilities for the import and export of printed matter. It was only by such means that people could form opinions on international and national situations and that democracy could become a reality.

The right to information created for people a source of enrichment and it operated against systematic obscurantism. It was only under those conditions that the press would become an instrument of peace, and cultural arrangements and freedom of the press would contribute to the maintenance of world peace by increasing mutual understanding between the nations.

Mr. Mackinnon (Australia) said that the draft resolutions should be acceptable to all who aimed at achieving international good will and cooperation through a better understanding of social, political and eco-

conomic problems. The resolution concerning cultural agreements was of great importance but its practical value depended on the application of the spirit of the second resolution.

It was in the freedom of information that the conflicting political systems of the world had encountered insurmountable difficulties, although in the Western countries there had been a willingness to give publicity to the letters and statements of Marshal Bulganin and Mr. Khrushchev during recent periods of crisis, and it was to be hoped that that attitude was reciprocated in the Soviet Republics and other countries within the Communist orbit.

The old saying "truth will out" had been sadly disproved in recent years in relation to the circulation of information of a political or economic nature, and the methods existing for controlling thought and the use of state educational systems to condition the minds of the young placed serious barriers in the path of truth.

Mr. Kelly (Brazil) said that it was remarkable that it was still necessary to defend at international conferences the most elementary of public rights—the freedom of information—because this freedom had preceded all the political regimes of our time and it corresponded to the sentiments of the common man. A great English actor had described it as the ability of everyone to say what he thought on any subject, even when he was thinking nothing, and a great Brazilian writer, the second Nabuco, had referred to the pleasure of agreeing that we disagreed.

The Brazilian delegation supported the principle based on Article 19 of the Declaration of Human Rights—that of seeking, receiving, and spreading information and ideas by every means and regardless of frontiers. In view of the limitation on the number of available channels and of the existence of international agreements, broadcasting was considered to be a public service, but this was a privilege of the State and not of the Government, of the whole national community and not only the party in power. The conference had discussed many important subjects, but what would become of their intentions and assertions if the word which expressed them could not reach the vast areas to which they were addressed?

Lady Davidson (Great Britain) said that the United Kingdom delegation believed profoundly in the value of freedom of the press and of the radio and in free speech, but with these freedoms must come self-discipline. A great British journalist had said that comment was free but facts were sacred. The aim of those responsible for spreading news should be the truth and nothing but the truth. Denying access to news must be condemned. The value of the B. B. C. News Service during the war had been its factual presentation of the news, good and bad, free from exaggeration and distortion.

All welcomed the visits to their countries of those taking part in sport, for example, but no one could be content until travel in all countries was unrestricted so that people could get to know each other by personal contact. No democracy could work unless it were based on the right of each individual to express his views freely and without fear, and the duty of each individual to treat with tolerance the views held by others. Only by a free exchange of information and a willingness to learn from each other could distrust and hatred be replaced by trust and understanding.

Mr. Chahkar (Iran) said that freedom of the press and of information was an integral part of the Iran constitution. The establishment of a democratic constitution in Iran owed much to the press who had conducted a vigorous campaign in favor of constitutional government. The principles laid down in Article 19 of the Declaration of Human Rights, had been stated more than 50 years earlier, in almost the same words, in

the constitutional law of Iran. The principle meant that no one need fear to express his opinions and that information could be spread freely.

In view of its services in defense of the democratic regime, the press in Iran had earned the gratitude of the people, and all classes of society defended the newspapers. The extraordinary development of newspapers and periodicals and other means of information during the last 10 years was striking proof of what he had said.

The obstacles between free cultural exchanges between individuals must be removed. He criticized biased news and propaganda, the purpose of which was to direct public opinion along given lines, because this hindered understanding between nations.

Mr. Castaneda (Philippines) said that the people of the Philippines believed sincerely that a reciprocal appreciation of the cultures and traditions of the different peoples of the world would bring closer understanding and serve as a basis for lasting peace and enduring friendship. It was important for people to learn to understand the lives of others.

The Philippines, realizing the importance of developing cultural relations with other countries, had been sending cultural attachés to her embassies and legations and had been sending groups of students abroad under the UNESCO plan and young workers under the ICA plan.

He regretted that the union had not yet taken a decision on the vital question of freedom of the press and information. In his country such a freedom was considered one of the citizen's sacred rights and the constitution expressly guaranteed the freedom of expression. If the minority in a country could not openly criticize this ideology of the majority, there was no democracy. The true test of democracy was the right of the minority openly and freely to criticize the party in power.

Mr. Berák (Czechoslovakia) said that it was necessary in the very interests of humanity itself to develop international cooperation without any distinction based on differences of economic or other systems. It did not matter whether countries belonged or did not belong to the same international organizations. If real relations were established between countries, people began to realize the problems and cultural riches of each other.

The national and international aspects of the freedom of the press and freedom of information were of great importance. His delegation felt that the purpose of the Inter-Parliamentary Union was surely to adopt the kind of recommendations and measures which in the field of information could contribute to the easing of international tension and the strengthening of mutual confidence. He felt that countries which sincerely desired peace would refrain from waging propaganda of hate, because that was not an expression of freedom of information but an abuse of it.

Mr. Boggs (U. S. A.) said that cultural exchanges were the most fruitful and most effective form of education, and perhaps the most indispensable in the atomic age. He referred to the program of Fulbright scholarships in the United States, which had provided for 33,000 scholars from 39 nations in 10 years, probably the largest educational exchange in the history of civilization.

They were told that the Soviet Union put its greatest thrust behind the education of its youth. His conviction was that an educated people, no matter how indoctrinated, would demand freedom. Police states were doomed in an educated society. If exchange programs did anything at all, they would throw into contrast and open examination the philosophies of the two systems. What was sought was not coexistence in an atmosphere of fear of atomic hostility but

understanding in an atmosphere of mutual trust. Freedom of the press could not be divorced from free government. Unless there could be untrammelled public expression of private views, the heartbeat went out of government by the people.

Mr. Kostourkov (Bulgaria) said that his delegation recognized the tremendous role played by the press in the formation of public opinion in respect of both foreign policy and domestic policy. It was easy to understand why differences of opinion occurred in such an organization as the Inter-Parliamentary Union, which was composed of countries with difference structures and different basic concepts. It was essential that the national groups should contribute to the best of their ability to the achievement of the common aims of the union, and everything possible must be done to prevent information being distorted. Propaganda in favor of war did not improve international cooperation or strengthen peace. It was necessary to forbid, by international conventions, if necessary, information being given in bad faith by the press as well as any abuse of the freedom of the press. Cultural agreements between countries with different political systems would make all rejoice.

Mr. Loureiro Jr. (Brazil) said that it could not be forgotten that each freedom carried with it a corresponding criterion of responsibility. It must be emphasized that the role of the press was eminently of a public character and, therefore, it carried with it a responsibility in a social sense. There ought to be some reference on behalf of the union to that aspect of the responsibility of the press. The press must have its actions clearly laid down with regard to the dignity and freedom of expression of the human individual. There was also the matter of the responsibility of the press to the existing public authority, which could not be allowed to be at the mercy of pernicious actions on the part of the press. Everywhere society suffered from such pernicious action and the conference should not fail to stress its rejection of offenses of that type against the moral order. Also, the conference should make it clear that it could not conceive of a representational regime where the state monopolized the means of information. He gave notice that he would express his views in a draft resolution to be submitted to the next conference.

Mr. Nowakowski (Poland) said that there was no doubt that coexistence and collaboration in the cause of peace between countries of different economic and social structures and regimes required, among other things, intellectual collaboration which must be on a broad base, honest and reciprocal in regard to information. That was required if there was to be throughout the whole world lasting peace, mutual confidence and collaboration and friendship among nations. Exchanges of information and the development of relations of an intellectual character between East and West were important from the political point of view as well as the cultural point of view. Poland was glad to have her scientists, students, artists, and workers of all kinds go to foreign countries to strike up bonds of friendship and to enrich Poland's science and experience. She would also be very glad to have her country visited more and more by similar persons from other countries.

Mr. Case (U. S. A.) said that all other freedoms depended on the freedom of information. The right to know the truth was a right of the people and should not be a monopoly of any government. One-man governments which dare not trust the people with the truth took from the citizen the facts which he had a right to know.

In the United States they believed that the State belonged to the people and that the people were entitled to have news without

17138

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 19

censorship. When Mr. Khrushchev wrote his letter to President Eisenhower about the Middle East, the American newspapers were free to print every word of it. They were not told by the Government what to say. Justice and freedom could be drugged and put to sleep by the sugar-coating of selfish political opinion in the name of news by governments who denied to their people a free exchange of information with other peoples of the world. There was no colonialism so enslaving as that which imprisoned the minds of men and made them the mental chattels of the State. The right of the people to know the truth must be recognized if governments were to be of the people, by the people, for the people.

Mr. Ronai (Hungary) said that regular cultural relations based on cultural agreements were an important part of international relations and that cultural agreements provided an effective way of achieving peaceful international cooperation. The conference was discussing cultural relations on a continent where the peoples had had a wonderful civilization destroyed by colonialism. Having achieved independence from colonialism, the countries of Latin America were making better progress, but they had many problems to face, such as illiteracy and contagious diseases.

The Hungarian National Group believed it their duty to extend the system of bilateral cultural agreements and to encourage mutual understanding of each other's civilization. These aims would remain pious wishes, however, unless peace and peaceful coexistence were assured. Consequently, he regretted the armed intervention of the United States and Britain in the internal affairs of the Arab countries, which seriously jeopardized peace in the Middle East and prevented the development of cultural relations.

The meeting rose at 6:25 p. m.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, inasmuch as I spoke on the subject of the right of the people to know the truth, and since I stated that I believe that freedom of information is the freedom on which all other freedoms depend, I now wish to read into the RECORD the address I delivered on that occasion. It reads as follows:

THE RIGHT OF THE PEOPLE TO KNOW THE TRUTH

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen of the conference, if the desires of mankind are what we have here heard expressed, the people of the world do not want an atomic war—they do not want any war.

The men and the women who have spoken here have spoken as one on that point. They have differed only on the ways in which we can make the desire for peace come true with liberty and justice for all.

Of all groups of men and women who might be brought together, this conference of members of parliamentary bodies should be the most accurate in reflecting what is in the hearts and minds of men and women everywhere because each of us comes as the representative of a constituency. Most of us are elected by the votes of that constituency, but whether elected or appointed, each of us is here to speak for the people we were chosen to represent.

To this conference, then, of parliamentary delegates, I speak on freedom of information with the conviction that on this freedom all other freedoms depend.

To this conference, I would say that the right to know the truth is a right of the people and is not a proper monopoly for any government.

Our agenda item No. 5 divides the topic into two parts: Exchanges of Culture and Exchanges of News as Information. I address my remarks to the latter—the exchange of news at home and abroad.

In passing, however, I testify to the good that is accomplished by the exchange of cultures.

It was good for the people of my country to learn of the appreciation accorded in Russia to a great pianist from the State of Texas, Mr. Cilburn. It has been good for the people of my country to learn of good sportsmanship and courtesy when athletes from my country compete with athletes of other lands, regardless of political ideologies. And I trust the ladies at home will forgive me if, in Rio de Janeiro and this atmosphere of Latin-America beauty, I confess there may be dividends for international appreciation from the victory by lovely Miss Colombia, in the competition for the title of "Miss Universe" held in the United States of North America only a few days ago.

Such exchanges of culture and skill, of talent and beauty do increase understanding among the people of the world.

The free exchange of other news and information, however, sometimes runs into trouble. This happens most often when the news relates to political programs and ambitions.

Those governments which see the state as the goal of every endeavor are inclined to seize control of information as a tool for the attainment of their ends regardless of the imprisonment which that decrees for honest, clear-minded judgment. Those one-man governments who dare not trust the people with the truth deprive the people of the facts to which every citizen has a right. This practice defeats the hopes in the hearts of mankind for freedom and understanding.

My country's independence began with a declaration that governments are formed to bring life and liberty and to permit people to pursue happiness. We hold that the state belongs to the people, that people are not the chattels of the state.

Consequently, we believe that the people are entitled to have uncensored news. When Premier Khrushchev wrote his letter to President Eisenhower about the situation in the Middle East, a few days ago, the newspapers of my country were free to print every word of the Khrushchev letter. The radio and the television carried whatever portions of the letter they desired to use and their time permitted. The people of my country reached their judgments on the basis of the statement itself, and in the light of past events in Warsaw, Leipzig and Budapest, as they had been freely reported insofar as the facts from those places were permitted to get to the world.

Someone once said that religion was an opiate for the people which I do not accept. True religion brings hope and purpose to human life. But there is something which does drug justice and put freedom to sleep. That is the sugar-coating of selfish political opinion in the name of news by governments which denies to their people the free exchange of information with other peoples of the world.

There is no colonialism so enslaving as that which imprisons the minds of men and makes them the mental chattels of the state.

As Mr. Philip Klutznick, United States representative to the General Assembly of the United Nations, said as lately as December 6, 1957:

"The freest and fullest flow of information is basic to a democratic system of government * * * In time of peace it is never safe to trust any men or institution of men with the power to decide for others what is good and what is bad information * * * There may be times when the majority will be mistaken * * * but * * * the truth eventually becomes apparent and right judgments will be made."

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen of the conference, on the 14th of December 1946, the General Assembly of the United Nations resolved that—

"Freedom of information is a fundamental right, and the touchstone of all the freedoms to which the United Nations is consecrated."

Therefore, I would wish that this conference of the Inter-Parliamentary Union might urge that knowledge of the truth and the free exchange of information be recognized as a right of the people and not as a property of any government.

Those who themselves are the mouthpieces for the people in representative government should be the first to proclaim the importance of the freedom of information. Unless the door is open for the free flow of news, we can never be sure of what is truth. The people must have their right to know recognized if governments are to be of the people, by the people and for the people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, following the printing of the address which I delivered at the Conference, which I have just now concluded reading to the Senate, the draft resolution, as adopted by the Conference, on the subject of "Cultural Agreements and Their Role in Improving Relations Between Peoples" and "National and International Aspects of Freedom of the Press and Information."

There being no objection, the draft resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

47th INTERPARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE, RIO DE JANEIRO, JULY 24 TO AUGUST 1, 1958—
AGENDA ITEM No. 5—CULTURAL EXCHANGES BETWEEN COUNTRIES AND FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

(A) CULTURAL AGREEMENTS AND THEIR ROLE IN IMPROVING RELATIONS BETWEEN PEOPLES

(Draft resolution presented, in the name of the Committee on Intellectual Relations, by Mr. Pierre Nethomb, Senator (Belgium).)

The 47th Interparliamentary Conference, recognizing the importance and growing volume of international cultural relations, as well as the interest which is shown in their development, and with the object of reaching a better understanding between different countries so as to facilitate the establishment of favorable conditions for peace and for durable friendship between them.

Stressing the need for eliminating all obstacles which hamper the freedom of cultural exchanges.

Considering that men living in all countries of the world, by reciprocal appreciation of their cultural achievements and by assimilating the best and most progressive of them in the various national cultures, can learn to understand more completely and deeply the life of other peoples, to respect their originality and national traditions, and to enrich each other spiritually.

Upholding the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on February 21 and November 28, 1957, stating that wider international cooperation in cultural and scientific matters must be encouraged by agreements and other means, and that no effort should be spared to achieve those noble objectives.

Taking note of the resolution adopted by the 44th Interparliamentary Conference on the conditions for a true peaceful coexistence between the nations and the resolution adopted at the Ninth General Conference of UNESCO.

Appeals to all Inter-Parliamentary Groups to work for the realization of the UNESCO project on mutual appreciation of cultural values of countries of the East and West;

Invites all Interparliamentary groups to contribute to the furtherance of regular intellectual exchanges between States as a means toward the conclusion of bilateral, regional, and multilateral agreements on cultural and scientific relations, and also on

1958

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

17139

other forms of cultural exchanges, such as visits and sojourns of students, pupils and young workers;

Recommends the creation of administrative bodies and special parliamentary groups for the promotion of a reciprocal policy of cultural relations in those countries where such organs do not already exist;

Hopes that the member groups of the Interparliamentary Union will use their influence on their respective governments in the sense of the present resolution.

(B) NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL ASPECTS OF FREEDOM OF THE PRESS AND INFORMATION

Draft resolution presented, in the names of the Committees on Intellectual Relations and Juridical Questions, by Mr. Pierre Gregoire, Deputy (Luxembourg).

The 47th Interparliamentary Conference, desiring to safeguard the right to freedom of expression and opinion as defined in article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Recalling the previous resolutions adopted on the subject by the Interparliamentary Union, the United Nations General Assembly, particularly on November 3, 1947, and the Ninth General Conference of UNESCO.

Declaring that this liberty implies the right, either active or passive, to information through radio, film, television, as well as by books, gramophone records and the press itself.

Considering that it is of importance to guarantee more effectively the free exchange of objective and nondistorted news, the protection of sources of information, the liberty of movement of foreign correspondents and the physical, social, and spiritual security of personnel in the information services.

Believing that it is necessary to guard against the maltreatment of news by a more equitable distribution of those means which guarantee the full right to information, impartially disseminated, by the development of professional techniques and by national and regional information bodies, which act as important auxiliaries in promoting economic and social progress in those countries which are lacking in this respect, as well as by the creation of councils, both national and international, for purposes of control and arbitration, and designed to bring about respect for different shades of opinion and to eliminate all abuses and rectify errors.

Stressing the necessity for encouraging the development of intellectual exchanges, the formation of specialized personnel, the creation of educational centers and the consolidation of scientific, cultural, technical, and sporting links.

Affirming the desire to continue its efforts toward the removal of obstacles hampering the free flow and integrity of information.

Condemning the use of false news which would by its very nature encourage hatred and provoke war, or would lead to the use of nuclear energy for other than peaceful purposes.

Appeals to its member groups to have adopted in their respective Parliaments the necessary measures for a free exchange of news, of information, and publications between research institutes, libraries, and cultural associations, as well as the free circulation of educational material and travel of persons journeying for journalistic or scholarly ends.

Invites the representatives of the different countries to approach the competent authorities with a view to putting an end to all restrictions on the exchange of ideas, particularly by aiding in the intensification of action already taken by United Nations organs and specialized agencies in the technical field, and to achieve durable cooperation between the Governments and the professions in question.

Requests that everything possible be done, either by adherence to international agreements or modification of national laws, to facilitate, in conditions of loyal reciprocity, exchanges of information likely to serve the cause of international peace and promote better understanding among nations as well as among individuals;

Resolves to appeal to the members of the Union to adopt, in their respective Parliaments, the necessary measures to make means of communication accessible to all branches of opinion in such a way that information does not become a privilege or a way of controlling public opinion.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, there was one rather interesting development in connection with the voting upon a resolution relating to the development of representative assemblies in non-self-governing territories. The draft resolution was carried by a vote of 461 yeas to 31 nays, with 62 abstentions.

I think the draft resolution should be inserted in the Record at this point, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

47TH INTER-PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE, RIO DE JANEIRO, JULY 24-AUGUST 1, 1958, AGENDA ITEM NO. 6—THE DEVELOPMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLIES IN NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES

(Draft resolution presented, in the name of the Committee on Non-Self-Governing Territories and Ethnical Questions, by Mrs. Supeni, Deputy (Indonesia)).

The 47th Inter-Parliamentary Conference, Believing that the progressive development of representative democratic institutions in non-self-governing territories is of the highest importance for the emancipation of the peoples of those territories,

Underlining the importance of the obligations laid down in Chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations in which states administering such territories are required to "develop self-government, to take due account of the political aspirations of the peoples, and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions";

Convinced that the aim of extending universal suffrage to all non-self-governing territories is directly in line with the ideals and aims of the Inter-Parliamentary Union,

Appeals to the national parliamentary groups of the states responsible for the government of such territories to promote and encourage within their respective parliaments legislation which would have as its object the building-up of truly democratic assemblies in non-self-governing territories;

And proposes:

(1) Rejection of all forms of colonial rule and subjection exercised by force upon the independence and freedom of another country;

(2) Solidarity with all colonized countries which have already obtained their freedom, as well as with all who still fight for their autonomy;

(3) Establishment of an international procedure which would guarantee to peoples desiring to become free of foreign tutelage that the substitution of foreign authorities by self-government would not be detrimental to human rights and the institutional forms of coexistence;

(4) Necessity for those governments, and particularly their parliaments, to be formed as the result of free elections—the only way in which legitimate power can be conferred and the people represented.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In conclusion, Mr. President, I may say I wrote, as of the customary day, a report to the people of South Dakota, in a letter written from Rio de Janeiro, on July 30, headed "Interparliamentary Conference at Rio." I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SENATOR FRANCIS CASE REPORTS—INTER-PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE AT RIO

RIO DE JANEIRO, BRAZIL, July 30.—Fifty-three countries of the world are members of the Interparliamentary Union meeting here for the 47th conference. Old hands at the meetings say that only at the meeting in 1939 prior to Hitler's march that started World War II has there been equal interest in the proceedings.

The primary reason, of course, is the tension over the situation in the Middle East where United States marines and paratroops landed in Lebanon even as many of these delegates were leaving their homes for this conference. But in the background is the growing realization that airplanes and rockets and sputniks have thrown us into one world.

The IPU differs from the United Nations in that this is a more informal body which was started by members of European assemblies who thought understanding would be promoted by their exchanging views. Among recommendations through the years were the World Court of Justice at The Hague, the League of Nations and even the organization which took the name of United Nations.

The IPU is not another U. N.—it is not a body which nations join by treaty. Its delegates are not named by the president, king, or other heads of states—but by the parliamentary bodies. In the main, they are people who have been elected to legislative bodies in their own countries.

Thus, in the main, they speak for constituencies. That is a point I mentioned in my conference address on Freedom of Information. We spoke from the background of legislators, not as spokesmen for an official government position.

It was impossible, however, under present world tensions, to avoid the tendency to regard speakers as exponents of home policies.

Russia's delegation included such persons as the head of their supreme court and the editor of *Izvestia* and a very able woman, Mme. Lepeveda.

Britain's delegation was headed by Herbert Morrison, one-time leader of her Labor government and Minister of Home Defense in Churchill's war government.

Austria's Dr. Ernest Korff was a very able committee chairman for the Committee on Armaments on which I served.

Indonesia had a woman delegate who spoke excellent English and with great persuasive ability. Several Latin American countries were represented by skillful and eloquent legislators.

Two goals marked the speeches of Russian delegates—proposals (1) to get a resolution that would condemn aggression in the Middle East by which they meant the presence of United States troops in Lebanon, and (2) to get a recommendation for immediate stopping of testing of nuclear weapons regardless of adequate inspection safeguards.

Speakers from all countries made clear that their people did not want an atomic war. A Japanese delegate pointed out that only the people of his country know the actual effects of an atomic blast. All the

17140

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 19

delegates from little nations spoke in fear—and wistful hope.

Preliminary drafts of resolutions on all agenda topics had been prepared by interim committees meeting at Geneva some months ago. For the most part, those drafts, carefully worked out, were adopted.

I had come to the conference with a speech on the operations of Public Law 480—the program of selling farm surpluses for foreign currencies and using much of the proceeds for aid loans in the underdeveloped countries. It appeared, however, that topic could be well assigned to Senator FRER, a member of the Committee on Agriculture, and I was assigned to speak on Freedom of Information and to serve as United States member for the Committee on Disarmament and International Police Force.

So, I wrote a new speech on the free flow of uncensored news as an important need for world understanding, which as a former editor I was very glad to do.

I advanced the proposition that if people are to be free, they must have a right to know what is the truth and that no government has a property right in news as a monopoly. I pointed out that when Khrushchev wrote to President Eisenhower recently, newspapers in the United States were free to print the entire text of his speech if they wanted to do so.

The session of the committee on disarmament was possibly the most interesting of the conference for me. A great deal of clever forensic and parliamentary ability was shown by various delegates. Each speech was interpreted into French and English. Speakers were brief and to the point.

In this committee, one amendment asking immediate cessation of nuclear tests and conversion of existing stocks to peaceful purposes was voted down, getting 9 yeas, 14 nays, and 3 abstentions. A resolution to commend Soviet Russia for "unilateral suspension" after she had completed her latest tests was beaten by 21 yeas to 7 yeas and 1 abstention.

An amendment to have the IFU set up a committee to prepare a plan for an International Police Force was beaten by 10 yeas to 9 yeas and 2 abstentions, but the idea of a police force was endorsed with 12 yeas, 8 nays, and 7 abstentions.

The overall resolution to urge parliaments at home and the United Nations to resume disarmament negotiations was endorsed unanimously.

This country of Brazil could easily be the subject of a report in itself. Today, with over 60 million people, more than half the total population of South America, Brazil expects to have 100 million by the year 2000.

In area, it is larger than continental United States and is the fourth-largest country of the world in total size. In resources, it is fabulously rich. Iron, copper, gold, diamonds, fine fruits, immense forests, and gigantic rivers for power are some of the principal ones.

And, as a cattle raiser, it was interesting to me to learn that the cattle population here is estimated at about 63 million, or one per person. In the United States we have approximately 95 million for 170 million people.

But Brazil has her problems. Her money is a sharp example of what inflation does. At the outset of World War II the rate of exchange was roughly 20 cruzeiros to a dollar. Today, it is 131.

In an effort to keep its money from flowing out of the country, Brazil has high import duties—\$5,000 on a Chevrolet car which will sell here with that duty for about \$14,000.

It is hard for the country to keep wages and prices in line under these conditions. But the Brazilians are ambitious and determined. They are looking forward to the visit

by Secretary of State Dulles. They want him to see the new capital they are building at Brasilia—at headwaters of an Amazon tributary, 600 miles west of Rio—where they decided to have a capital city nearer the heart of their country.

When they started 14 months ago, Brasilia was a native village of 500 persons. Today, it has 30,000 people with a 10,000 foot runway and modern buildings.

Brazil is a nation on the move. It will be well if the United States of America and the United States of Brazil can remain strong and good friends in the half century ahead.

Senator FRANCIS CASE.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, concluding my remarks, may I say to the distinguished occupant of the Chair [Mr. CHURCH] and to the other Senators who have had the patience to listen to me at this late hour tonight, I believe representation in the Interparliamentary Union is worth while. Certainly, if we believe in representative government, it is worth while for those who are selected and who represent constituencies to get together and exchange points of view, and give to other countries where parliamentary government is trying to increase the freedom of the people of the world the methods and ideas by which we seek in our country to advance the cause of freedom. We can gain from the experience and exchanges of viewpoints and procedures which take place in the parliamentary bodies of other countries.

Some countries may differ in the selection of their representatives, delegates, or senators. Some of the countries do not have the political maturity our country has. But to the extent that such countries have parliamentary bodies in which the people can be represented and have a voice in government, to that extent will free government really come to exist in all countries where there is government of the people, for the people, and by the people.

So I hope, as we approach the time when the 48th Conference of the Interparliamentary Union will be held at Warsaw, Poland, next year, Members of our Congress may take appropriate steps to insure an interested and alert delegation, and one which will make a contribution to the deliberations of parliamentary bodies which will take place behind what is called the Iron Curtain.

I hope that conference, as this recent one has, will make a contribution to the development of freedom in the world.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on page 16744 of the RECORD of yesterday, August 18, 1958, when the Presiding Officer put the question on an amendment, the amendment was not that of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], but that of the junior Senator from New York. I ask that the correction be made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The correction will be made.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New York for making the correction, because as the RECORD appears, I am in the position of having offered an amendment and then voting against it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to make another statement. I am delighted that the Senator from North Carolina is here. Yesterday the Senator from North Carolina sought unanimous consent to have a division after the question had been decided by a ruling of the Chair. I thereupon objected. I express to the Senator from North Carolina my regret. I had never done that before; I hope never to do so again.

I then went to the Senator from North Carolina. I think the RECORD should show that I asked him whether he felt very strongly about it. He said no; that the matter was finished, and that he did not feel too strongly about it. I said if he did, and if he would make his unanimous consent request again, I would not object.

I desire the RECORD to show the mutuality of courtesy on both sides.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I corroborate the statement of the able and distinguished junior Senator from New York. As he said, he very graciously came to me and offered to withdraw his objection. I told him I appreciated it very much, but that I did not consider the matter of such importance that he should do so.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from North Carolina. I am very glad to have the RECORD show this mutual exchange of our respect for each other.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following additional report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. KENNEDY, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with an amendment:

H. R. 12728. An act to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, with respect to the payment of compensation in cases where third persons are liable (Rept. No. 2481).

ADDITIONAL BILLS INTRODUCED

Additional bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S. 4310. A bill for the relief of Dr. Taro Mori; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MALONE:

S. 4311. A bill to abolish the functions of the Bureau of Indian Affairs of the Department of the Interior, to remove the guardianship over Indians and trusteeship over Indian lands, and to repeal the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984), as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. MALONE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. McNAMARA, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. THYE, and Mr. YARBOROUGH):

S. 4312. A bill to strengthen the Commissioned Corps of the Public Health Service